

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-6 and 11-18 were rejected. Claims 7-10 and 19 were allowed. In response to the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 15, 17 and 18 and 19 are amended. Claims 2, 5 and 6 are cancelled. In addition, claim 20 was added to this response. No new matter has been added. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1, 3, 4, and 7-20 will be pending in the present patent application. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 and 11-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner submitted that the phrase “accurate forward projection” is indefinite as it is unclear what constitutes an accurate forward projection as opposed to any other forward projection. In response to the Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 11, 15, 17, 18 and 19 to remove the term “accurate”. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the §112, second paragraph rejection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6, 381,349 B1 (hereinafter “Zeng”). Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration.

The Examiner indicated that claims 2-4 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response to the Office Action, Applicants have cancelled claim 2 and amended claim 1 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 2 into claim 1. In addition Applicants have cancelled claims 5 and 6. In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully

submit that the rejections under 35 USC §102(b) have been obviated, and that claims 1, 3, 4 are in a condition for allowance.

New claim 20

Newly added claim 20 recites implementing an iterative image reconstruction process for CT metrology of an object, wherein the iterative reconstruction process utilizes prior outer edge information obtained from a modality in addition to CT. Applicants added claim 20 to point out additional patentable features. No new matter is added. Claim 20 is patentable for the same reasons as indicated by the Examiner as for the other claims.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/11/2005

29
Patrick S. Yoder
Reg. No. 37,479
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545